

Ser. No. 09/719,290
Response to Office Action of 3/21/05
Atty Docket 117210-27

- 8 -

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner states that claim 1 as amended contains new subject matter, referencing particularly, the language "plurality of second circuits not including a central processor," which is stated to not be described in the specification. Claims 2-16, being dependent upon claim 1, were therefore also rejected on this basis.

35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

With respect to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, the applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 as amended, reciting that the portable docking display unit includes a plurality of second circuits, with the plurality of second circuits not including a central processor, is fully and clearly supported by the original application as filed, and no new matter has been introduced by this language. This subject matter is further supported in the originally filed provisional application, on which the present application claims priority. With reference to the application as originally filed, and particularly with reference to Fig. 3 and the associated description, the detachable handset unit 20 is shown to clearly include a central processor 11, while docking display unit 30 does not include a processor therein. In the associated description, it was originally stated that the detachable handset unit 20 includes an electrical connector 23 that carries signals from the central processor 11 through video interface 15, keyboard interface 16, communication interface 17, pen-input interface 51, audio interface 29, and a power supply 14. The specification went on to originally state that mating electrical connector 36 of the docking display unit 30 connects these signals from the electrical connector 23 of the detachable handset unit 20 to the circuits of the docking display unit 30. As set forth on page 6, lines 7-15 of the original specification, the electrical connector 36 connected the signals from central processor 11 via the interfaces of the detachable handset unit 20 as described, to the auxiliary circuits of the docking display unit 30. As further stated and clearly described in the original specification, when the detachable handset unit is docked into the docking display unit, the detachable handset unit provides the processing power to the docking display unit, referring the Examiner's attention to page 3, lines 15-17 of the original specification, and page 7, lines 5-7.

Ser. No. 09/719,290

- 9 -

Response to Office Action of 3/21/05

Atty Docket 117210-27

As further stated in the original specification on page 7, lines 10-16, the central processor carried by the detachable handset unit is stated to include enough processing power to adequately perform functions of the entire portable device when docked with the docking display unit.

In accordance with the clear description and content of Fig. 3, which as originally filed, provide clear support for the claimed subject matter according to claim 1, it is believed that the rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, should be withdrawn. Further, to clarify these aspects of the present invention as originally disclosed, various amendments have been made to the specification, which again do not introduce new matter in any way, but merely clarify the subject matter as set forth in the originally filed application, as well as the provisional application on which it is based.

Based upon the foregoing, it is believed that the present invention as now claimed in claim 1, is fully and clearly supported by the original specification, and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph is in order, and is hereby respectfully requested. If any further issues relating to this rejection are apparent, the Examiner is requested to contact applicant's representative for discussion thereof.

Election by Original Presentation

The Examiner indicated that newly submitted claims 17-24 were directed to an invention independent from the originally claimed invention, and were therefore withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. Claims 17-24 have now been amended to relate to the invention as originally claimed, and are therefore believed to be properly examinable along with original claim 1 and those claims dependent thereon. In addition, claim 25 has been submitted herewith, also directed to the invention as originally claimed in the application, and being clearly distinct from the prior art. In both independent claims 17 and newly added claim 25, the present invention is defined as having a portable handset wherein at least one input device associated therewith is coupled to a central processor. A docking display has a second display controlled by the central processor of the portable handset so as to be operational only when docked therewith. The prior art in no way reflects upon a device wherein a detachable handset having a central processor, is used to control operation of a portable docking display unit, which is only operational when docked with the

Akron - 96836.1

Ser. No. 09/719,290
Response to Office Action of 3/21/05
Atty Docket 117210-27

- 10 -

handset, as now called for in claim 17. Further, in relation to claim 25, the prior art does not relate to a portable processing device having a detachable handset unit with a central processor and a plurality of first circuits and a portable docking display unit having a plurality of second circuits, with at least one of the plurality of second circuits being operated solely by the central processor of the detachable handset. Similarly to the other independent claims, the prior art simply does not anticipate or make obvious such a combination, and this claim, in conjunction with the other independent claims, is believed to clearly distinguish from the prior art. The prior art of Grewe and Jones, as cited by the Examiner, do not teach or suggest a detachable handset unit, having a processor which controls operation of not only circuits within the detachable handset unit, but also a portable docking display unit as set forth in these claims.

Based upon the foregoing, it is believed that the claims are now fully in accord with 35 U.S.C. §112, and the rejection of claims based thereon should be withdrawn. These claims, along with the additional claims submitted herewith, are believed to clearly distinguish from the prior art and be in allowable condition, and favourable action hereon is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Hahn Loeser & Parks, LLP



Scott M. Oldham
Registration No. 32,712
Attorney for Applicant

One GOJO Plaza Suite 300
Akron, OH 44311-1076
(330) 864-5550
Fax 330-864-7986
smoldham@hahnlaw.com

Akron - 96836.1